

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA** §  
§  
v. § **CRIMINAL CASE NO. C-14-261**  
§  
**BRENDA CISNEROS GARCIA** §

---

**ORDER GRANTING UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE**

---

On August 31, 2015, Defendant moved for a continuance of the trial setting on the following grounds: Defense counsel needs additional time to review Defendant's status to potentially avoid immigration consequences. (D.E. 44).

Under the Speedy Trial Act, a district court may grant a continuance and exclude the resulting delay from the time in which a trial must commence if it makes on-the-record findings that the ends of justice served by granting the continuance outweigh the public's and defendant's interests in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7).

Having considered Defendant's motion, the Court finds the following § 3161(h)(7)(B) factors apply to the case at hand:

- \_\_\_\_ (1) That the failure to grant such a continuance in the proceeding would be likely to make a continuation of such proceeding impossible, or result in a miscarriage of justice.
- \_\_\_\_ (2) That the case is so unusual or so complex, due to the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or for the trial itself within the time limits established by the Speedy Trial Act.

(3) That, in a case in which arrest precedes indictment, delay in the filing of the indictment is caused because the arrest occurs at a time such that it is unreasonable to expect return and filing of the indictment within the period specified in section 3161(b), or because the facts upon which the grand jury must base its determination are unusual or complex.

X (4) That the failure to grant such a continuance in this case which, taken as a whole, is not so unusual or so complex as to fall within clause (2) above, would deny the defendant or the government continuity of counsel, or would deny counsel for the defendant or the attorney for the government the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

       (5) Other relevant factors:

Accordingly, the Court finds that the ends of justice are served by granting a continuance in this case and outweigh the best interests of the public and Defendant in a speedy trial. The Court **GRANTS** Defendant's motion and **CONTINUES** the final pretrial conference until **September 28, 2015 at 9:00 a.m.** and jury selection/trial until **September 29, 2015 at 9:00 a.m.**

ORDERED this 31<sup>st</sup> day of August 2015.

  
NELVA GONZALES RAMOS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE